REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, and 10 are amended. Claims 3-5, 7-9, and 10 are amended to remove indefiniteness and typographical errors.

Claims 1-10 remain in the Application. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I.   Claim Objections

Claims 3, 9, and 10 are objected to because the period for ending each of these claims is missing. Applicants amend these claims to correct the typographical errors. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

II.   Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,356,587 issued to Choi ("Choi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,279 issued to Paik ("Paik").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the relied upon references must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art.

Claim 1, as amended, recites the elements of "forming a plurality of regions in each block, each region defining a direction; and....comparing results of the arithmetic operations among the directions of a corresponding block to determine an edge direction component for the corresponding block, the arithmetic operations using an averaged luminance value of each region represented in terms of the DCT coefficients."

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach or suggest these elements. Choi is relied on for disclosing the extraction of DCT coefficients. The Examiner recognizes that Choi does not disclose comparing results of the arithmetic operations, but relies on Paik to remedy the deficiencies.

Paik does not cure the deficiencies of Choi. Paik does not disclose "comparing results of the arithmetic operations among the directions of a corresponding block." Rather, Paik discloses comparing the DCT coefficients with pre-determined threshold values (col. 4, lines 21-26). Paik further discloses that these threshold values can be adjusted by a user (col. 4, lines 26-27). Comparing the coefficients with user-adjustable threshold values does not involve forming directional regions in a block and comparing the results among the directions of the block. Thus, Choi in view of Paik does not teach or suggest each of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Moreover, the cited references do not teach or suggest the limitations of "the arithmetic operations using an averaged luminance value of each region represented in terms of the DCT coefficients" as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claim 1 are requested.

III.   Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 2-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendment to base Claim 1 has placed these claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claims 2-10 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 2, 2007

William V Babbitt

W. Thomas Babbitt, Reg. No. 39,591

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Amber Saunders 3/2/2007

Amber Saunders   Date